



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EFFECT OF THE CLERICAL OFFICE UPON
CHARACTER.

THE clergy and their office are related to each other as organism and environment ; and therefore the purpose of any study of our subject would clearly be to point out the characteristic reactions which human nature exhibits when subjected to the special influences of the clerical profession. At the very outset of our investigation, however, it becomes necessary to call attention to the fact that neither organism nor environment is a fixed quantity. Not only do all sorts of men seek and obtain admission to the Christian ministry, but also the office itself has undergone great and radical changes in the course of its long and eventful history. It is evident, therefore, that the same environment will affect unlike natures in very unlike ways, while similar natures will, on the other hand, exhibit certain marked divergencies if subjected to aggravated differences in the ecclesiastical milieu. Hence any thorough and profitable treatment of the subject in hand would be such as should trace the curves of moral change in the clergy incident upon certain important changes in their office. The faithful discharge of such a task would, we believe, give results of considerable interest and value ; and we heartily recommend it to any one who has the leisure and ability for its prosecution. All that the present writer can hope to accomplish, however, within the narrow limits assigned him, is, first, to point out some of the more radical transformations which the clerical office has undergone, together with their attendant effects upon the character of a great number of the clergy ; and, second, to indicate the more important influences which the office, as it at present exists in Protestant communions, exerts upon the rank and file of its incumbents.

The original relation of church officers to the rest of the Christian community was simply that of leadership. "Liberty of prophesying" was acknowledged in the apostolic age and in the time of Tertullian. In the Apostolical Constitutions we

read that if a layman possess the proper qualifications, he may teach, and the Ignatian Epistles give evidence of the fact that in the absence of church officers, meetings were held and the eucharist celebrated. The officers of the first Christian congregations were, therefore, not regarded as possessing, by virtue of their office, exclusive powers. All Christians were alike priests unto God. The functions exercised by the leaders, aside from the matter of order, were such as belonged to the whole community. Ordination was looked upon as a solemn appointment to office, and not as a magical rite by means of which special spiritual gifts and powers denied to the laity were bestowed. During these early times, also, the church was poor and often persecuted, and the officers pursued secular callings, such as banking and the practice of medicine. In addition to this the position of the office-bearer was, in many cases, the position of danger, and he who became a Bishop prior to the famous conversion of Constantine, frequently risked his life. From this hasty description of the clerical office as it existed in primitive times, it will be seen how little it could contribute to the formation of those defects and vices which in later ages became the marks and badges of clericalism.

With the political triumph of Christianity, however, the clerical office was radically transformed. Constantine took Christianity under his protection and showed his favor first of all by granting the officers of the Christian churches immunity from public burdens and exemption from the ordinary jurisdiction of the civil courts. He also pensioned not only the clergy, but their widows and orphans. The clergy thus became a privileged class as well as a class "civilly distinct" from the rest of the community.

In addition to imperial patronage other causes were at work which effected great and far-reaching changes in the clerical office. Asceticism demanded that the clergy should lead the "higher life," and should avoid not only marriage but amusements. In time they became still further distinguished from the laity by the tonsure and a special dress. Superstition, too, was at work, and assigned to the priest peculiar powers

analogous to those accredited to the Jewish and heathen priest-hoods. It was, of course, inevitable that such sweeping alterations as these in the clerical office should produce their effects upon human character. The office became the road to wealth and power, while the immunity from civil burdens which its holders enjoyed induced many of the richer citizens to seek within its protecting care an escape from imperial taxation. Thus it came about that the office developed, among many other evils, the sin of avarice, and also became the seed-plot of worldly ambition. Even Jerome paints in dark colors the corruptions of the Roman clergy, and there can be no doubt that in fostering these corruptions the constitution of the clerical office had no inconsiderable share.

But further and important changes were to come. Under Constantine the clergy had been transformed from the leaders of democratic societies to a senate or separate aristocratic order with special privileges and emoluments. Under the great Popes of the Middle Ages they were raised into a monarchic and despotic class. Hildebrand brought the Emperor to Canossa, and the clergy became not only spiritual but temporal rulers. In addition to being the keepers of the human conscience and the repositories of human learning, they became statesmen, princes, and warriors. Celibacy, too, was enforced with extreme rigor under Hildebrand, and with most disastrous results to the morals of the clergy. The inviolability of the priests and their immunity from the jurisdiction of the secular courts made the commission of terrible crimes and unblushing immoralities among them facts of common occurrence. The Church became, indeed, in the very worst sense, a kingdom of this world, and its officers were for the most part pre-eminently worldlings. Clerical office was more than ever the road to wealth and power, and offered, moreover, to lust and greed an almost secure asylum of enjoyment. In brief, the clergy, who had become a sacerdotal caste, exercising despotic and supernatural powers, were, in the language of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, "a source of pollution to the whole earth." There can be little doubt, therefore, that the clerical office as

it existed in the Middle Ages was productive in the main of the most disastrous results to the character of the clergy. My purpose in the foregoing sketch, however, has simply been to point out that changes in the official environment leave their marks upon the moral organism of the official.

The Reformation in its turn wrought extensive changes in the clerical office, which in the long run have reacted favorably upon ministerial character. With few exceptions, the Protestant clergy are no longer regarded, neither do they regard themselves, as a sacerdotal caste. They have ceased to hold a monopoly of learning, and the increasing cultivation of the pews has been known, in some instances at least, to bring about humility in the pulpit. In England the "Benefit of Clergy," which was throughout a period of many years variously abridged and modified, was finally abolished in 1827, under George IV. In these United States Roman Catholic as well as Protestant divines are citizens of the Republic, and although Church property is still exempted from taxation, the individual clergyman bears his share of the civil burdens, and is amenable to the jurisdiction of the secular courts. The salaries, moreover, which are paid to the vast majority of Protestant ministers can hardly be said to constitute a temptation either to flesh or imagination, and he who craves wealth or the privilege of an unfettered development of mind never dreams of taking holy orders. In this country, too, no church enjoys, or rather suffers from, the patronage of the state. Clerical dress, also, is becoming less common, and in addition to the many clergymen whose outward attire can in no way be distinguished from that of respectable laymen, there are others, who, with high-cut vests and secular coats, may be said to mark a transition period between this world and the next. Furthermore, the disposition to honor the parson because of what he is rather than by reason of his ghostly office is daily growing in strength and latitude. On the whole, therefore, we may confidently affirm that the clerical office as it exists to-day in most Protestant churches approximates in some important particulars to that which was exercised by the leaders of the Christian congre-

gations during the first two centuries. It is equally certain that the moral character of the great majority of clergymen is far higher than it was in seventeen and eighteen hundred; and although many causes have no doubt contributed to this result, the effect of those changes in the clerical office which have largely abolished sacerdotalism and materially lessened privilege and patronage, cannot but be reckoned as good. The sources of moral regeneration lie, indeed, deeper than the atmosphere of office. Pure men have in all ages of the Church resisted the temptations to which their ecclesiastical environment exposed them, as well as availed themselves with pious care of its spiritual advantages. In like manner we may purify the atmosphere without cleansing the lives of many of those who live and move in it. In other words, the office does not necessarily make the man, although it unquestionably influences him for evil or for good. Due, therefore, as the improvement in the clergy is to causes which have improved society at large, yet the reformation of the clerical office itself cannot but exert, for the most part, salutary effects upon those who occupy it, as well as determine, for the good of the Church, who shall become her office-bearers.

And yet, notwithstanding the abolition of "Benefit of Clergy," and in this country of state patronage,—despite the repudiation by almost all Protestants of the sacerdotal conception of the clerical office and the consequent lessening of the gap between ministers and people, the clergy still remain, in many respects, a separate and privileged class; neither do they wholly escape the evils of patronage. It is, moreover, these three characteristics of the clerical office to which, in the opinion of the writer, most of the bad effects which it exerts upon the character of the clergyman may be ultimately traced. To some of the more important of these as they at present exhibit themselves I shall now turn my attention; and if it should seem to my readers that in the course of this paper I have dwelt too exclusively upon the evil effects of the clerical office, I can only inform them I have done so of set purpose. I am by no means blind to the virtues of the clergy, nor to the fact that their office is capable of high and holy

influences. I shall, moreover, before I close, take occasion to mention what I regard some of these influences to be. On the other hand, I cannot but state as a fact of personal experience that *cæteris paribus* the admirableness of clerical character is in inverse proportion to its officialism. Other things being equal, the less a clergyman relies upon his office and the more he depends upon the human qualities of love and purity and mental rectitude, the higher will he stand in the scale of moral being. Dr. Hatch, speaking of the clergy, says in his admirable Bampton Lectures, "But of what they came to be, it is difficult to speak with a calm judgment, because the incalculable good which they have wrought in the midst of human society has been tempered with so much of failure and of sin. One point, at least, however, seems evident, that that incalculable good has been achieved rather by the human influence which they have exercised than by the superhuman power which they have sometimes claimed." To "the superhuman power which they have sometimes claimed" we might add most of their official prerogatives, for it is a fact palpable to most intelligent laymen that not only is the good which the clergyman accomplishes chiefly attributable to his manhood and not to his office, but also what is more to our present purpose that certain characteristics of the office itself seriously handicap and impair the development of his mental and moral character. At any rate the writer of this paper has taken special pains to question a number of sensible laymen—some twenty-one in all—as to their opinion of the effect of the clerical office upon character, and in every instance but one the answer was instantaneously given: "Bad." It would seem that we have here all the required elements of certainty, since we are not only presented with the cordial unanimity of twenty gentlemen, but also furnished in the case of the twenty-first with that inestimable supplementary proof of the rule—the exception.

But to proceed to specifications. It has been said that the Protestant clergy, despite the transformations which their office has undergone in modern times, still remain a separate and privileged class, and do not altogether escape the moral dan-

gers of patronage. And first of all as to the evils of separateness or official isolation. There is a sense, of course, in which every clergyman, as every Christian, should keep himself separate and unspotted from the world, but we are speaking of class or official separateness. This official separateness begins at the time of ordination. Comparatively few Protestant clergymen, be it said to their honor, believe that "the laying on of hands" confers upon them any necromantic functions, or even endows them with hitherto unenjoyed qualities of mind or character; and yet great numbers of them feel in a vague sort of way that their ordination ought to affect their intellectual and moral status, and so they forthwith proceed to speak and act as if it actually had done so. This assumption, combined with the assurance that, having been made ministers of the gospel, they must now not only go into uniform, but generally adopt a style of utterance and deportment suited to their position, leads to unnaturalness. This unnaturalness exhibits itself in a great variety of forms, but in general it may be described as a failure to furnish normal and healthful reactions to the ordinary stimuli of social environment. "One rarely feels," wrote a friend of mine a few weeks ago, "that a clerk in holy orders is absolutely spontaneous and frank." "The clergyman," wrote another, "is always made up. He knows that he is expected to be a model, and so he endeavors to be one."

Now there can be no question that the compulsion to be an ensample unto the flock is a good influence in the clergyman's life so long as this compulsion is moral, but when it is chiefly official,—when, in other words, the cleric feels himself obliged to be an example to others rather by virtue of his office than because of the world's crying need of righteousness,—then the evil effects of office are likely to display themselves in assumed airs of wisdom or sanctity. I remember once being present when a clerical friend of mine, with the assistance of a humble parishioner, was busily engaged in packing up his library. During a pause in the operations the parishioner glanced about the room and seeing that there were still many volumes remaining upon the shelves, exclaimed, "Gracious me! It must have taken an awful long

time to read all these books." Instead of frankly admitting that he had not looked inside half of them, the clergyman promptly replied, "Oh, these are not many." He was expected to be wise, and he did not disclaim the flattering impeachment. To show that I have not misinterpreted his words, I might add that he afterwards confessed to me it would never have done to let the man suppose he had not read the books of his own library. This, if one will, is but a mild form of deceit, and yet it shows the effect of trying to make people believe that we are either better or cleverer than we are. Moreover, the temptation to present an outward appearance which shall correspond with the current expectations of what a clergyman ought to be is one which is pre-eminently characteristic of the clerical office, and leads to those affectations of manner and hypocrisies of speech which we have classed under the general head of unnaturalness.

Then, too, the separateness of the clergyman's position helps to place him upon a pedestal. He is looked up to with a reverence and deferred to with a respect to which, often enough, neither the weight of his opinions nor the exceptionalness of his piety entitles him. The women, in particular, are prone to burn incense before him. They laugh immoderately at his poorest jokes, praise his emptiest sermons, and follow him about with looks of ill-concealed admiration. The men, it is true, are more reserved in their demonstrations of regard than the women, but even they can hardly be excused from granting that deference to "the cloth" which is only rightfully due to the virtues and abilities of the man. The effect upon poor human nature of this undue, and in most cases undeserved, exaltation, is that it forms the habit of thinking of itself more highly than it ought to think. Whatever may be the virtues of the clerical profession, it is certain that humility is not one of them. Accustomed to be listened to without rejoinder, they show a marked impatience of candid criticism; and when actually subjected to contradiction and put into a corner they evince a strong disinclination to fight fair, as well as a perverse desire to dodge the whole question at issue. The results, therefore, of the official elevation, which,

be it remembered, falls to the lot of even the humblest clergyman, are likely, according to the nature of the man, to be dogmatism, effeminacy, arrogance, vanity, "a too great love of praise," priggishness. At any rate, prig and priest stand very close to each other in the dictionary.

A further effect of the office is that it serves to stifle originality and to produce automatism, not merely of manners, but of mind. It provides a livery for the intellect as well as the body. And hence, where the sense of official rather than of intellectual responsibility is very strong, it is tradition rather than personal experience which stocks alike the clerical mind and the clerical vocabulary. "I suppose there are certain phrases and expressions that you feel you must always use in preaching," said a layman to me several years ago, and therein avowed his recognition of the extent and obligation of clerical uniformity. Such official conformity to tradition, whether enforced by canon or required by the dictates of the priestly conscience, is the undoubted enemy of spontaneity of thought and feeling,—of inspiration,—prophecy. And when to this intellectual uniformity which the office tends to induce is added the daily round of clerical duties, together with the necessity of preaching several times a week, it can be seen how difficult it is in such an environment to avoid mechanicalness of mind, and to preserve the freshness of the well-springs of feeling. Even so fertile and spontaneous a soul as that of Frederick W. Robertson testifies to the effect of parochial routine and constant preaching in the following memorable words. "It reminds me," he says, "of the 'Song of the Shirt,'—'Work, work, work;' and the perpetual tread-mill necessity of being forever ready twice a week with earnest thoughts on solemn subjects is a task which is quite enough to break down all originality, and convert a race-horse into a dray."

Perhaps the most noticeable influence, however, which the clerical office exerts upon intellectual character is its tendency to dull, and even destroy, in certain most important directions, the powers of perception and observation. The clergy, in the main, regard themselves as the recipients of a sacred

deposit of revelation which, in the form that has been given it by their particular branch of the church, is held to be final and complete. In their opinion, no increase of knowledge, no change in the point of view, no development of the mind, can impair the validity of those doctrinal statements which they have accepted as essential to the faith. For most of them the questions involved in these statements are forever closed. To examine the basis of belief is looked upon as treason. Hence the clergy, as a class, are not investigators, and have, as a rule, been found to be hostile to investigation. They are not seekers after truth, but the advocates of a system. They regard it as their mission to enforce belief rather than to promote research. Consequently, while they are addicted to what Carlyle calls "logicizing," their powers of insight or perception, except within a very narrow field, are untrained and undeveloped. When men are assured they know it all, it is not likely that they will make a good use of their eyes.

In confirmation of the foregoing statements we take great pleasure in calling the attention of our readers to a typical product of the clerical mind, in the shape of an article written by the Rt. Rev. Leighton Coleman, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of Delaware, and published in the *North American Review* for January, 1893. The title of the article is "The Limits of Legitimate Religious Discussion," and in it the right reverend gentleman maintains that any one who questions that Christ is God, or who feels disposed to doubt the binding moral obligation of the two sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, is beyond the pale even of religious discussion. With a liberality of mind truly beautiful to behold, he adds, however, "I am quite prepared to admit that there are some points in regard to the sacraments which may be legitimately discussed,—*e. g.*, the mode of Baptism," and then goes on to say,—“But as to their necessity, there is no room for debate.” . . . “It is not an open question. In fact, it has never been anything else but a closed question, except as those who are rebellious have dared to debate it.” Whatever else may be said of the intel-

lectual attitude revealed in the foregoing quotation, we can hardly be accused of exaggerating or distorting it when we affirm it to be hostile to investigation and the exercise of the perceptive powers. In the judgment of the Bishop, certain questions are forever closed, and he is a traitor who presumes to critically examine them. To show that the Bishop has given us not merely a fair sample of theological argument, but a vivid picture of the clerical intellect as well, we cannot forbear relating a story of a colored preacher, told by Mr. Edward Eggleston in one of the *Scribners* of 1878. The occasion of the story is a baptism. "Before leading the neophytes into the water, the negro preacher," says Mr. Eggleston, "improved the occasion to make a few very solemn and feeling remarks to his hearers. 'Now, my breddern,' he chanted in a doleful recitative, 'you all 'll want to know what's de reason dat immussion is de only mode ob babtism. Well, now, my breddern, bless de Laud, 'tain't none o' yoah business.'" "'Tain't none o' yoah business" was the negro preacher's way of announcing that the question was closed, and we have no doubt that upon the occasion just referred to the reverend gentleman was eminently successful in suppressing religious discussion.

But not only does the adoption of a fixed dogmatic system as a final statement of truth discourage the development of insight and observation, it also, together with what we may term the class apperceptions of the clergy, often blinds them to facts quite above ground, and visible to every normal eye. In proof of this we once more quote Dr. Coleman, whose article we believe deserves far more attention than it has actually received. Remembering that a Christian, according to Dr. Coleman, is not only one who must believe that Christ is God, but also one who insists upon the moral obligation of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, we are confronted on the fifteenth page of the review with the following remarkable declaration: "A man who is not a Christian cannot be accounted a moral man." To accept this is to deny the facts of moral vision. And yet in extenuation of the Bishop's blindness as well as in confirmation of our present contention that the

effect of the clerical office is to dull the powers of perception, we feel ourselves bound to add that Dr. Coleman confesses in another part of his article to exceptionally bad eyesight. "Of what use are the eyes," he says, "without the telescope, except to see dimly and uncertainly?" The reason, therefore, that the Bishop is unable to recognize such men as Dr. James Martineau, Dr. Edward Everett Hale, and countless others as moral men, must be due to the fact, that when he takes his walks abroad in the moral world he leaves his telescope at home. Adopting and adapting the dying words of the great William Tyndale, the devoutly ethical soul cannot but pray: "Lord, open the Bishop of Delaware's eyes."

And now let us turn to the effects of the office in so far as it procures for the holders of it certain legal and private privileges not extended to most other men. The legal privileges since the abolition of "Benefit of Clergy" are few in number, and need not detain us. That the clergy in a Christian community should nowadays be granted immunity from military service is almost inevitable, whereas exemption from duty in the jury-box has many and weighty arguments in its favor. It is the private or unwritten privileges of the clerical office whose effect upon character we wish to notice. The most prominent of these are what may fairly be called "pauper privileges," and take the forms of clerical discounts, donation parties, scholarships for clergymen's sons, and the like. Almost all papers and magazines offer special rates to the parson, while not a few stores and hotels successfully advertise themselves through systematic pauperization of the clergy. "Our experiment of advertising teas and coffees at very low rates to the clergy throughout the United States has met with great success"—such is the first sentence of a circular sent me not long ago by a firm of aspiring merchants. "We have given much earnest thought during the past two months to a consideration of just how to make a New Year's donation to the clergy of America," wrote a far too prominent company of booksellers and publishers at the close of 1892. Such are a few instances, and many more might be mentioned, of the modern survivals of "Benefit of Clergy."

Their effect is to lessen the manliness and self-respect of many worthy men, who, because they are underpaid and have, not infrequently, large families to support, willingly grasp at almost any chance to eke out their miserable incomes.

But it is not the poor clergymen alone who avail themselves of such clerical privileges. I once heard a comparatively wealthy parson plead for a reduced fare at the ticket-office of a large railway station, and he went away greatly incensed because his plea was denied. Among the well-to-do clergy who are reluctant to lose a chance of saving a penny, these monetary privileges often develop phases of closeness and meanness sad to behold. "Perhaps if you are a good girl, Mrs. T. will give you two cents' worth of candy for a cent," said a minister of the Gospel to his little daughter whom he had just taken into a small confectioner's shop. This was said, of course, in the presence of Mrs. T., who, by the way, was one of his own parishioners, and hard put to it, besides, to make both ends meet. Now it is this desire of getting two cents' worth of anything for a cent which the privileges at present granted to the clergy serve to develop. This may be business, but it certainly is not Christianity.

Furthermore, the effect of privilege in general is to beget the belief among the clergy that the laws which govern other men do not hold good for them. Sometimes this belief betrays itself in naïve and amusing forms. Not long ago, while busily engaged in the reading-room of a large public library, I was greeted by a clergyman, who drew me into conversation. After the exchange of a few sentences, I pointed him to a placard whereon all conversation was emphatically forbidden. He turned and glanced at it for a moment, and then once more addressing himself to me, smilingly replied, "But that, of course, is not meant to apply to us clergymen." He was in earnest, too, for he went on talking.

But the sense of privilege has other and graver consequences. I have known clergymen unblushingly apply money to other objects than those specified by the donors. And yet they meant nothing wrong. They were simply availing themselves of a professional privilege. Among laymen,

however, such an act would be called "misappropriation of funds." Exceptional privileges may, therefore, go so far as to dull the sense of honor and blunt the fine edge of moral judgments.

And now a final word upon the effects of the patronage to which, because of their official position, the clergy are exposed. It is to be admitted, of course, that patronage is not an unmixed evil, neither are the clergy the only ones who have been subjected to its influences. Poets and philosophers have had their patrons as well as the ministers of Christ. And yet it remains true that ever since Constantine took the church under his protection the evils of patronage in some form or other have been apparent among the clergy. It is not my purpose at present to follow the changes which patronage itself has undergone. Suffice it to say that while, in the Established Church of England, both individuals and corporations are the owners of "livings," and therefore the patrons of the incumbents, in these United States the patron, except in those parishes which are ruled by one or more wealthy men, is the public. Formerly men dangled at the heels of the powerful and great, now they are tempted, in the majority of cases, to pay their court to the people. This transference of patronage from the monarch or the nobleman to the public at large has had its far-reaching consequences for good, and yet he who supposes that in escaping the clutches of the individual tyrant we have, therefore, either in journalism or the pulpit, attained the estates of mental independence and moral courage is laboring under a grievous mistake. The public may be as exacting in its demands as the veriest despot of ancient times, and even more wilful in the bestowal of its favor. In the men who cater to this public we observe the recurrence of the self-same vices that disgraced the days of individual patronage. An undue deference to the demands of the people may display itself in the clever diplomacy of the "man of tact," as well as in the vulgar flattery of the common demagogue; in the timid reticence of the scholarly rector as well as in the cheap discourses of the popular preacher. And whatever may be the means by which men

attempt to disguise the disagreeable fact, it remains unquestionably true that the people have a decided power over the parson, and are by no means indisposed, in many instances, to exercise it.

The power of the people, then, being such as it is, we confidently believe that certain crying evils which we have observed in some of the clergy are largely attributable to the public patronage they endeavor to secure. To do my brethren of the clergy justice, I do not believe them to be money-loving men, but in the matter of preferment they are, as the English say, exceedingly keen. The love of preferment, be it also observed, is a clerical vice of long standing. It was rife in the Middle Ages, and later on the famous and brilliant Rochester remarked in no very complimentary terms upon its widespread prevalence. At one time it was to be obtained by purchase; now it is for the most part in the gift of the people. To win the people is to obtain success; hence the sensationalism of many pulpits and the general commercialism of clerical thought and life. What can be the object of the men who advertise themselves to preach upon such subjects as the following: "A Troubled Woman's Anonymous Letter," "Trials and Triumphs of a Boston Boarder," "Is your Trolley on the Wire?" and so on *ad infinitum et ad nauseam*? To the same desire for patronage we attribute the widespread desertion of those religious questions with which the minds of intelligent men are busily occupied, for the discussion of "Town Talk" and "Current Topics." If the clergy could but give the world richer and more thoughtful expressions of the religious life, instead of second-hand discourses on socialism and economics, we believe the world would be greatly in their debt. But richer and more thoughtful expressions of the religious life have their dangers for ambitious men. They are not invariably popular, and have, in addition, a natural tendency to come into collision with the ecclesiastical authorities. And so the evils of the patronage to which the holders of the clerical office are exposed are abundantly manifest. Now, as always, they are self-seeking, time-serving, the destruction of mental integrity and moral courage, together with

the loss of that pure and lofty spirit of unworldliness which is of the essence of the Kingdom of Heaven.

We have now pointed out in detail some of the more important and characteristic effects of the clerical office upon character. That this high office has other effects than those we have enumerated, we gladly acknowledge, but these last we believe to be most prominent where the claims of human brotherhood transcend the consciousness of class and privilege, and where the sense of official position is lost in the sacredness of human duty. The position of a clergyman gives him exceptional opportunities for high and holy thought as well as rare and innumerable chances for the doing of good. Many also are the men who are conscientiously availing themselves of these great *moral* privileges of their office, and to whom we may justly apply the words in which Chaucer described the parish priest of his own day :

“Christē’s love and hys Apostles twelve
He taught, but first he followed it himselve.”

LANGDON C. STEWARDSON.

WORCESTER, MASS.

RELIGIOUS SENTIMENT AND THE MORAL PROBLEM IN ITALY.

My colleague at the University of Naples, Professor Raffaele Mariano, in his article in the January number of the JOURNAL, has dissented from an opinion of mine concerning the historic problem of the influence of the Church of Rome and of the Papacy on the spirit and life of the Italian people. I wrote on this subject in the Review *La Nuova Antologia*,* and Professor Mariano replied to me in a lengthy address, delivered before the Academy of Moral Sciences in Naples, entitled “Is Catholic Italy Christian or Pagan?”

The point at issue in the discussion † was this : What impor-

* June 10 and July 1, 1891.

† Several Italian and foreign Reviews took part in it: among others, *La Revue Chrétienne*, September, 1891; *La Revue Suisse*, July, 1892; London *Spectator*, November 21, 1891.